



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,200	02/19/2004	Jean Fernand Armand Lacrampe	JAB 1626-Div 2	4094
27777	7590	12/29/2004	EXAMINER	
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/782,200

Applicant(s)

LACRAMPE ET AL.

Examiner

Venkataraman Balasubramanian

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/19/04.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The preliminary amendment, which included cancellation of claims 1-12 and addition of new claims 13-42, filed on 2/19/2004, is made of record.

Claims 13-42 are now pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13-19 and 36-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Following reasons apply. Any claim not specifically rejected is rejected as being dependent on a rejected claim.

1. Recitation of the "process of marking or identifying a receptor" in claims 13-19, and " a method of evaluating receptor binding ability of a test compound" in claims 36-42, renders these claims indefinite, as it is not clear what is meant by "process of marking or identifying" and what is the difference between these and "a method of evaluating receptor binding ability of a test compound". Both these methods appear to be same and difference in scope is not clear. In addition specification has no definition of the term "process of identifying" and hence it is not clear what is intended.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1624

Claims 13-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for radiolabelling of compound of formula I or I' with radiolabelled cyano group or methyl group such ^{11}CN or ^{14}CN or $^{11}\text{CH}_3$ or $^{14}\text{CH}_3$, does not reasonably provide enablement for radiolabelling with any or all possible radioactive element or group generically embraced in the claim language. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The following apply:

In evaluating the enablement question, following factors are considered. Note In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1. The nature of the invention and the state of the prior art:

The invention is drawn to a process of radiolabelling and then using the radiolabelled compound of organ imaging. Specification is not adequately enabled as to how to make perform radiolabelling of compounds of formula I or I' in general and particularly the compound is variously substituted with reactive functional groups which are either susceptible to radiolabelling agent or the conditions. Radiolabelling is a specialized art and often done on the last step or one or two steps earlier to the last step. As result, it is often require a suitable precursor for such radiolabelling.

Specification on pages 22-23 merely suggests few radiolabels but does not teach or suggest how to perform such a radiolabelling process. There is no teaching of making a suitable precursor. In addition there is no single example in the specification showing how to perform the radiolabelling. Prior art studies relying on general radiolabelling approach at best would such the introduction of radiolabelled cyano as the precursor ketone is taught in the specification. Furthermore, radiohalogenation often require oxidizing conditions and there are various functional groups in the instant compound that are susceptible to such oxidation. For example thiocarbonyl group, mercapto group are known to undergo S-oxidation. There are no prior art for guidance that would suggest that structurally related 1,2,4-triazine compounds could be radiolabelled. Given the general nature of the radiolabelling and the radiolabels embraced, it would not be possible for one trained in the art to redeem such a radiolabeling as a routine process.

2. The predictability or lack thereof in the art:

Hence the process as applied to the above-mentioned compounds claimed by the applicant is not an art-recognized process and hence there should be adequate enabling disclosure in the specification with working example(s).

4. The amount of direction or guidance present:

Examples illustrated in the experimental section or written description offer no guidance or teachings as to how perform the process of making radiolabelled compounds in general and particularly when reactive substituents or chemically incompatible substituents are present in the starting material.

Art Unit: 1624

5. The presence or absence of working examples:

There are no representative examples showing the viability of the process for radiolabelling with or without plurality of reactive substituents embraced in the instant claims.

6. The breadth of the claims:

The breadth of the radiolabelling includes any or all radiolabel for which there is no support in the specification. Specification has no support, as noted above, for all compounds generically embraced in the claim language would lead to desired radiolabelled compound of formula I or I' with said reactive groups and there is also no valid chemical reasoning for one trained in the art to expect that all these functional groups would be inert toward the radiolabelling process.

7. The quantity of experimentation needed:

The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden on skilled art in the chemical art since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan for the many reasons stated above. Even with the undue burden of experimentation, there is no guarantee that one would get the product of desired structure, namely compound of formula I embraced in the instant claims.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", the "level of skill in the art and predictability, etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the case for the instant claims.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the

Art Unit: 1624

application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In *re* Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make and use Applicants' invention.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).


Claims 13-42 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 13-42 of copending Application No. 10/671,205. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the method of uses of azauracil compounds claimed in the instant claims overlap with the method of uses for the same genus of azauracil compounds claimed in the copending application 10/671,205.

Art Unit: 1624

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is Mukund Shah whose telephone number is (571) 272-0674. If Applicants are unable to reach Mukund Shah within 24-hour period, they may contact James O. Wilson, Acting-SPE of art unit 1624 at 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.


Venkataraman Balasubramanian

12/26/2004